

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/510,848	10/13/2004	Kiichi Meguro	50389-053	3835
20277 7590 01/10/2008 MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP			EXAMINER	
600 13TH STR	EET, N.W.		KUNEMUND, ROBERT M	
WASHINGTON, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1792	
		•	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/10/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Office Action Summary		10/510,848	MEGURO ET AL.	
		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Robert M. Kunemund	1792	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
VVHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DANSIONS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim till apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ARANDONE	l. ely filed the mailing date of this communication.	
Status				
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 Oct</u> This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under Ex	action is non-final. ce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5)	Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-23 and 25-28 is/are pendidal Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-3,5-13,15-23, and 25-28 is/are rejected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceed Applicant may not request that any objection to the did Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner The oath or declarati	on from consideration. cted. election requirement. pted or b) □ objected to by the Eleawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is objected.	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 				
2)	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary (Paper No(s)/Mail Dat 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	e	

10/510,848 Art Unit: 1792

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 12, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jp 3093695 in view of Takahiro (jp 03-075298).

The Jp 3093695 reference teaches a method of growing and a diamond structure note entire reference. On a substrate, a layer of diamond nucleation sites is prepared. The sites are orientated the same for the vapor growth, note figures. Then a layer of polycrystalline diamond is grown on the nucleation sites. The nucleation sites can be diamond, note abs. The orientation is of the polycrystalline layer. The sole difference between the instant claims and the prior art is nucleation sites being single crystal diamonds placed next to each other. However, the Takahiro reference teaches that large single crystal diamonds can be placed together to create a base for diamond

Art Unit: 1792

growth, note translated abs. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the Jp 3093695 reference by the teachings of the Takahiro reference to use single crystal diamond base in order to ensure that the grown vapor layer of diamond has uniform orientation.

Claims 2, 3, 5 to 11, 15 to 20, 22, 23 and 25 to 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jp 3093695 in view of Takahiro (jp 03-075298).

The Jp 3093695 and Takahiro reference are relied on for the same reasons as stated, supra, and differ form the instant claims in the dimensions of the layers and orientations. However, in the absence of unexpected results, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to determine through routine experimentation the optimum, operable dimensions and orientations in the combined references in order to create a uniform layer of diamond improving the properties.

Response to Applicants' Argument's

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3, 5-13, 15-23 and 25-28 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert M. Kunemund whose telephone number is 571-272-1464. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr can be reached on 571-272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

10/510,848

Art Unit: 1792

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Robert M Kunemund Primary Examiner Art Unit 1792

RMK